UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,883	12/13/2000	Jeffrey A. Dean	0026-0006	5681

44989 7590 01/24/2008

HARRITY SNYDER, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER	
DEBROW, JAMES J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/734,883	DEAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James J. Debrow	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 November 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *39 and 41-66* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *39 and 41-66* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Appeal Brief filed on 05 Nov. 2007

2. Claims 39 and 41-66 are pending in this case. Claims 39, 47, 52 and 59 are independent claims.

Reopening of Prosecution After Appeal Brief

3. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 05 Nov. 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new grounds of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

DOUG HUTTON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Applicant's Response

4. In Applicant's Response dated 05 Nov. 2007, Applicant argued rejections of previous action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 39, 41, 44-46, 52, 53, 56-61 and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong et al. (NPL: "WebWatcher: A Learning Apprentice for the World Wide Web", Publish date: 1995) (hereinafter 'Armstrong') in view of Pant et al. (Patent No.: 6,012,053; Filed Jun. 23, 1997) (hereinafter 'Pant').

In regards to independent claim 39, Armstrong discloses *a computer-implemented method comprising:*

identifying a document that is stored on a server in a network and that includes links to linked documents (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses identifying a web page/document that contains links to other web pages/documents.);

determining scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses the WebWatcher finds hyperlinks on the page/document that are strongly recommended by its search control knowledge. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.);

providing the modified document to a user (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses the WebWatcher finds hyperlinks on the page/document that are strongly recommended by its search control knowledge, Then highlights the most promising links and sends this modified copy of the return page to the user.).

Armstrong does not expressly disclose *modifying the identified document based on the determined scores, where the modifying includes:*

reordering at least two of the links based on the determined scores, or

sorting at least two of the links based on the determined scores; and

However, Pant teaches *modifying the identified document based on the determined scores, where the modifying includes:*

reordering at least two of the links based on the determined scores, or sorting at least two of the links based on the determined scores (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts the search results in an order ranked according to their relevance score.);

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Armstrong with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claims 41, 53 and 61, Armstrong discloses *the wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents* (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses identifying a web page/document that contains links to other web pages/documents.)*;*

wherein determining the scores includes:

for each of the linked documents, determining scores for one or more linking documents that contain links to the linked document (section 2, para. 4 &6; Armstrong discloses prefetching web pages and beginning the process to determine their most promising outgoing hyperlink. Armstrong also discloses the WebWatcher could be made to search several pages ahead to improve the quality of the advice it provides. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the scores of the one or more linking documents (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses the WebWatcher finds hyperlinks on the page/document that are

strongly recommended by its search control knowledge. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document (section 2, para. 4 &6; Armstrong discloses prefetching web pages and beginning the process to determine their most promising outgoing hyperlink. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

In regards to dependent claims 44, 56 and 64, Armstrong discloses *the method wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents;*

wherein determining the scores includes:

receiving input from the user (section 2, para. 2; Armstrong discloses the WeWatcher program allows the user to identify the type of information he seeks.).

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the received input (section 2 & 4; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses the WeWatcher program allows the user to identify the type of information he seeks. Armstrong also discloses the WebWatcher finds hyperlinks on the

page/document that are strongly recommended by its search control knowledge. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document (section 2, para. 4 &6; Armstrong discloses prefetching web pages and beginning the process to determine their most promising outgoing hyperlink. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

In regards to dependent claims 45, 57 and 65, Armstrong discloses *the method of wherein determining the score for each of the linked documents includes:*

for each of the linked documents, comparing one or more words of the received input with a content of the linked document (section 3.2; Armstrong discloses comparing words entered by the user with a content of the linked document.).

determining a score for the linked document based on a degree of match between the one or more words and the content of the linked document (section 3.2; Armstrong discloses comparing words entered by the user with a content of the linked document. Words are first gathered by every distinct word that occur over the training set, then ranked according to their mutual information. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation the Examiner concludes ranked one or more words according to their the mutual information to be analogous with determining a score for the linked document based on a degree of match.).

In regards to dependent claim 46, Armstrong discloses *the method of claim 39, wherein modifying the identified document includes:*

comparing the determined scores to a threshold (section 4.2; Armstrong discloses experimenting with adding a threshold on the confidence of the advice from the WebWatcher. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation the Examiner concludes Armstrong's experiment to include but not limited to comparing the determined scores to a threshold.).

Armstrong does not expressly disclose *deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.*

Pant teaches *deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold* (col. 13,

lines 9-31; Pant teaches results based on a score and a relevance factor of words matched in a query. A change in the relevance factor does not change the search and number of hits, but the presentation of the results differs. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the presentation of results differs to include but not be limited to deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Armstrong with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to independent claim 52, Armstrong discloses *a computer-implemented method, comprising:*

identifying a document that is stored on a server in a network and that includes links to linked documents (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses identifying a web page/document that contains links to other web pages/documents.);

determining scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document (section 2, para. 4 &6; Armstrong discloses prefetching web pages and beginning the process to determine their most promising outgoing hyperlink. Armstrong also

discloses the WebWatcher could be made to search several pages ahead to improve the quality of the advice it provides. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

comparing the determined scores to a threshold (section 4.2; Armstrong discloses experimenting with adding a threshold on the confidence of the advice from the WebWatcher. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation the Examiner concludes Armstrong's experiment to include but not limited to comparing the determined scores to a threshold.).

Armstrong does not expressly disclose *deleting one of the plurality of links from the identified document when the score for the one of the links falls below the threshold;*

Pant teaches *deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold* (col. 13, lines 9-31; Pant teaches results based on a score and a relevance factor of words matched in a query. A change in the relevance factor does not change the search and number of hits, but the presentation of the results differs. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the presentation of results differs to include but not be limited to deleting one of the links from the

identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.).

providing, to a user, the identified document without the deleted link. (col. 13, lines 9-31).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Armstrong with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 58, Armstrong discloses *the method of claim 52, further comprising:*

determining additional information regarding the linked document pointed to by the one of the plurality of links (section 3.2)

providing the identified document with the additional information to the user (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses sending a modified copy of the return page to the user.).

Armstrong does not expressly disclose *determining additional information regarding a linked document pointed to by the one of the plurality of links when the score for the one of the links does not fall below the threshold;*

Pant teaches *determining the score for the one of the links does not fall below the threshold* (col. 13, lines 9-31; Pant teaches results based on a score and a relevance factor of words matched in a query. A change in the relevance factor does not change the search and number of hits, but the presentation of the results differs. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes Pant teaches the concept of determining that a score for one of the plurality of links is greater than the threshold.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Armstrong with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to independent claim 59, Armstrong discloses *a system, comprising:*

means for identifying a document based on an address associated with the document, the document including links that point to linked documents (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses identifying a web page/document that contains links to other web pages/documents.);

means for determining scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document (section 2, para. 4 &6; Armstrong discloses prefetching web pages and beginning the process to determine their most promising outgoing hyperlink. Armstrong also discloses the WebWatcher could be made to search several

pages ahead to improve the quality of the advice it provides. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

means for comparing the determined scores to a threshold (section 4.2; Armstrong discloses experimenting with adding a threshold on the confidence of the advice from the WebWatcher. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation the Examiner concludes Armstrong's experiment to include but not limited to comparing the determined scores to a threshold.).

means for determining additional information regarding the linked document pointed to by the one of the plurality of links (section 3.2).

means for providing the identified document with the additional information to a user (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses the WebWatcher finds hyperlinks on the page/document that are strongly recommended by its search control knowledge, Then highlights the most promising links and sends this modified copy of the return page to the user.).

Armstrong does not expressly disclose *means for determining that a score for one of the plurality of links is greater than the threshold.*

Pant teaches *means for determining that a score for one of the plurality of links is greater than the threshold* (col. 13, lines 9-31; Pant teaches results based on a score and a relevance factor of words matched in a query. A change in the

relevance factor does not change the search and number of hits, but the presentation of the results differs. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes Pant teaches the concept of determining that a score for one of the plurality of links is greater than the threshold.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Armstrong with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 60, Armstrong discloses *the system of claim 59, further comprising:*

means for determining that a score for another one of the plurality of links is not greater than the threshold (section 2, para. 4 &6; section 4.2; Armstrong discloses prefetching web pages and beginning the process to determine their most promising outgoing hyperlink. Armstrong also discloses the WebWatcher could be made to search several pages ahead to improve the quality of the advice it provides. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended. Armstrong discloses experimenting with adding a threshold on the confidence of the advice from the WebWatcher. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation the

Examiner concludes Armstrong's experiment to include but not limited to comparing the determined scores to a threshold.).

Armstrong does not expressly disclose *means for deleting the other one of the plurality of links from the identified document*;

means for providing, to a user, the identified document without the deleted link;

Pant teaches *means for deleting the other one of the plurality of links from the identified document* (col. 13, lines 9-31; Pant teaches results based on a score and a relevance factor of words matched in a query. A change in the relevance factor does not change the search and number of hits, but the presentation of the results differs. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner concludes the presentation of results differs to include but not be limited to deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.).

means for providing, to a user, the identified document without the deleted link (col. 13, lines 9-31).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Armstrong with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 66, Armstrong does not expressly disclose *the system of claim 59, wherein the additional information includes an excerpt from the linked document, a size of the linked document, or a date of last modification of the linked document.*

However, Pant teaches *the additional information includes an excerpt from the linked document, a size of the linked document, or a date of last modification of the linked document* (col. 6, line 21-32; Pant teaches a relevance factor is a value associated with an attribute which an item in a database may have. For example whether a document contains a particular word is an attribute of a document, date, size and other features of a document may be attributes. It has been established and is well known in the art that these features are typically provider to the end-user as additional information of linked documents.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Armstrong with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

Note

7. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and

may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

8. Claims 47-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arthurs (Patent No.: US 6,591,261 B1; Effective Filing Date: Jun. 21, 1999) in view of Pant et al. (Patent No.: 6,012,053; Filed Jun. 23, 1997) (hereinafter 'Pant').

In regards to independent claim 47, Authers discloses *a computer-implemented method, comprising:*

receiving a search query (col. 6, lines 43-47; Authers discloses through a computer system, the end-user typically visits a search engine site residing on a server computer system to enter a search query. Thus receiving input from the user.);

providing a list of search results in response to the search query (col. 4, lines 1-24; col. 7, line 4-col. 8, line 54; Arthurs disclose providing a list of search results in response to the search query.);

receiving selection of one of the search results in the list of search results (col. 4, lines 1-24; col. 7, line 4-col. 8, line 54; Arthurs discloses the user selects a displayed web site by clicking on a link.);

identifying links in a document corresponding to the selected search result (col. 4, lines 1-24; col. 7, line 4-col. 8, line 54; Arthurs discloses the user selects

a displayed web site by clicking on a link adjacent to that web site via the end-user computer system mouse.);

determining a score for one of the links based on a degree of match between the search query and a content of a linked document pointed to by the one of the links (col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose the search results are ranked in accordance to their score.);

Arthurs does not expressly disclose *modifying the document based on the determined score for the one of the links ;*

providing the modified document.

However, Pant teaches *modifying the document based on the determined score for the one of the links* (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts the search results in an order ranked according to their relevance score.);

providing the modified document (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches sorted/modified results are provided to the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 48, Arthurs disclose *the method of claim 47, wherein determining the score for the one of the links includes determining scores for each of a plurality of the links in the document based on a degree of match between the search query and a content of a linked document pointed to by the link* (col. 6, line 19-col. 7, line 3; Arthurs disclose the search results are ranked in accordance to their score.);

Arthurs does not expressly disclose *wherein modifying the document includes: reordering the links based on the determined scores.*

However, Pant teaches *modifying wherein modifying the document includes: reordering the links based on the determined scores* (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts the search results in an order ranked according to their relevance score.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 49, Arthurs does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 48, wherein reordering the links includes: sorting the links based on the determined scores.*

However, Pant teaches *reordering the links includes: sorting the links based on the determined scores* (col. 2, lines 25-43; col. 3, lines 56-63; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts the search results in an order ranked according to their relevance score.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 50, Arthurs does not expressly disclose *the method of claim 47, wherein modifying the document includes:*

changing at least one visual characteristic of the one of the links within the document based on the determined score.

However, Pant teaches *changing at least one visual characteristic of the one of the links within the document based on the determined score* (col. 6, line 50-col. 7, line 50; Pant teaches a sorting module which sorts/displays the search results based on different relevance factors. The Examiners using the broadest interpretation of a visual *characteristic of the one of the links within the document based on the determined score* to include placement of the link within the search

result. Thus Pant teaches or suggests changing the visual characteristic of one of the links.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Arthurs with Pant for the benefit of providing a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to the user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search resulted are ordered and presented (col. 1, lines 53-56).

In regards to dependent claim 51, Arthurs discloses *the method of claim 47, further comprising:*

comparing the determined score to a threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold.);

deleting the one of the links when the determined score for the one of the links falls below a threshold (col.2, lines14-23; col. 6, lines 5-16; col. 10, lines 34-36; Arthurs teaches or suggest the concept of comparing the determined scores to a threshold. Arthurs disclose the association database may utilize any threshold values to remove data from the database. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Arthurs teachings in deleting one of the links from the identified document when the determined score for the one of the links falls below the threshold.).

Note

9. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

10. **Claims 42, 43, 54, 55, 62 and 63,are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong in view of Pant further in view of Page (Patent No.: 6,285,999 B1; Filed Jan. 09, 1998)**

In regards to dependent claims 42, 54 and 62, Armstrong discloses *the method wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents* (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses identifying a web page/document that contains links to other web pages/documents.);

associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document (section 2, para. 4 &6; Armstrong discloses prefetching web pages and beginning the process to determine their most promising outgoing hyperlink. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

Armstrong in view of Pant does not expressly disclose *wherein determining the scores includes:*

determining a clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents.

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rates.

However, Page teaches *determining a clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents; determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined clickthrough rates* (Page teaches determining the clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents based on determined clickthrough rates and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the document. The examiner interprets the user of clickthrough rate in the claim as equivalent to determining the popularity or how many hits the documents has had by other links linking to the document and determining how important that document is. For example, Page discloses node ranking in a linked database to assign a rank to each document in the database where the document rank is a measure of the importance of the document based on the anchor text of backlinks to the document (regardless of its content)(col 2, lines 40-65).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Armstrong in view of Pant to include determining importance, scoring and associating that with an

entry in the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by counting its number of citations (col. 2, lines 20-35).

In regards to dependent claims 43, 55 and 63, Armstrong discloses *the method wherein the links in the identified document point to a plurality of linked documents* (section 2; Fig. 4; Armstrong discloses identifying a web page/document that contains links to other web pages/documents.).

associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding links in the identified document (section 2, para. 4 &6; Armstrong discloses prefetching web pages and beginning the process to determine their most promising outgoing hyperlink. The Examiner concludes the WebWatcher program would implicitly determine scores for a plurality of the links in the identified document in order to determine which document are strongly recommended.).

Armstrong in view of Pant does not expressly disclose *wherein determining the scores includes:*

determining a measure of popularity associated with each of the linked documents,

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined measure of popularity.

Page teaches *determining a measure of popularity associated with each of the linked documents, determining a score for each of the linked documents based on the determined measure of popularity* (Page teaches determining the clickthrough rate for each of the linked documents based on determined clickthrough rates and associating the determined scores for the linked documents with the corresponding entries in the document. The examiner interprets the user of clickthrough rate in the claim as equivalent to determining the popularity or how many hits the documents has had by other links linking to the document and determining how important that document is. For example, Page discloses node ranking in a linked database to assign a rank to each document in the database where the document rank is a measure of the importance of the document based on the anchor text of backlinks to the document (regardless of its content)(col 2, lines 40-65).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Armstrong in view of Pant to include determining importance, scoring and associating that with an entry in the document as taught by Page, providing the benefit of a simple method for determining the importance of a document by counting its number of citations (col. 2, lines 20-35).

Note

11. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and

may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

William L. Bashore

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER